

**RAY LAND EXCHANGE/PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT
FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
ERRATA**

1. The FEIS and FSEIS had conflicting information regarding whether the mineral potential of the Offered Lands had been assessed. The FSEIS incorrectly stated that the mineral potential of the Offered Lands had not been assessed (page 86). As stated in the FEIS (page 3-79), the Offered Lands were assessed for mineral potential. The majority of the Offered Lands exhibited a low potential for the accumulation of salable, locatable or leasable mineral resources. However, several areas totaling approximately 1,126 acres have a moderate potential for locatable mineral resources. Most of the Offered Lands have a low potential for salable mineral resources (such as sand, gravel, and decorative rock), with the exception of decorative rock boulders on the Sacramento Valley Parcel, and sand and gravel on the Gila River Parcel at Cochran.
2. The FEIS and FSEIS had incorrect information regarding the status of the subsurface mineral estate of some of the Offered Lands parcels, specifically the Tomlin Parcel Group. The FEIS Table 2.1 (page 2-2) incorrectly stated that the Tomlin Parcels were full estate, and that BLM would file a petition to withdraw Tomlin Parcel #4 from mineral entry (page 2-3). The FSEIS incorrectly stated that BLM would acquire the subsurface mineral rights of the Tomlin Parcel Group (page 12). As verified in the most recent title report on the parcels, the subsurface mineral estate of the Tomlin Parcel Group is owned by Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company and is not a part of the land exchange package. The BLM would not acquire the subsurface mineral estate of these parcels, and BLM would not be able to recommend for mineral withdrawal Tomlin Parcel #4 as the FEIS stated because the BLM does not administer mining on privately owned land.